

United States Patent and Trademark Office

(V)
STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO	
10/712,162	11/13/2003	Frederick Wilkins	10168-7081.19	8203	
37462 LOWRIE. LA	7590 06/28/200 [.] NDO & ANASTASI	EXAMINER			
RIVERFRON	T OFFICE	PHASGE	PHASGE, ARUN S		
ONE MAIN S' CAMBRIDGE	TREET, ELEVENTH F E. MA 02142	LOOR	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	.,	•	1753	2	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		· ·	06/28/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summany		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)						
		10/712,16	52	WILKINS ET AL.					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Arun S. P		1753					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply									
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on _								
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is								
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposition of Claims									
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.									
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)⊠	☑ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.								
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
8)□	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exar	miner.							
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)	accepted or b)	objected to by the E	xaminer.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) b	e held in abeyance. See	37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.									
Priority`u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No									
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage									
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).									
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.									
Attachment					•				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date									
3) 🛛 Inform	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date		5) Notice of Informal Pa						

Application/Control Number: 10/712,162

Art Unit: 1753

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over EP 1,172,145 in view of Briggs, U.S. Patent 2,535,035 and Bianchi et al. (Bianchi), U.S. Patent 4,830,721.

The Ep patent is cited to show a conventional electrodeionization cell, wherein water is purified (see figures 1-4).

The patent fails to disclose the feeding through the cathode to control pH or the addition of hydrogen to reduce the corrosiveness of the water.

The Briggs patent is cited to show it is well recognized to control the pH of water that has been electrochemically treatment by feeding it through the cathode to obtain the desired pH. Likewise, the Bianchi patent is cited to show the use of hydrogen to reduce the corrosiveness of deionized water (see claims 1-7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosure of the EP patent with the teachings of the secondary references, because the secondary references teach the feeding through the cathode compartment to control the pH and reduce corrosiveness of water.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi,

Application/Control Number: 10/712,162

Art Unit: 1753

759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of copending Application No. 10/712,674. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the copending application fully encompass and render obvious the claims of the instant application.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Arun S. Phasge whose telephone number is

(571) 272-1345. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY, 7:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nam X. Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1342. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or

571-272-1000.

Arun S. Phasge Primary Examinan

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1753